

Appl. No. 09/683,650
Amtd. dated June 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the specification:

The specification contains numerous spacing errors. Appropriate correction is required.

5 Response:

The applicant has carefully read through the specification in order to identify and correct all errors. Amended paragraphs of the specification are shown in the "Amendments to the Specification" section above. Acceptance of the corrected specification is respectfully requested.

10

2. Rejection of claims 1, 3-11, 13, 15-23, and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1, 3-11, 13, 15-23, and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Douglas for reasons of record.

15 Response:

Claims 1, 13, and 23 have each been amended to overcome this rejection. Each of these claims now contains the limitation that the selection program is used for selecting a plurality of icons, and that the icons are displayed on the monitor such that the user is capable of recognizing the plurality of selected icons. This limitation is supported in paragraph [0020] of the specification, and no new matter has been added to the claims.

On the other hand, Douglas does not teach selecting a plurality of icons such that the user is capable of recognizing the selected icons. Instead, Douglas only teaches selecting a single icon at a time. The user is able to recognize the selected icon from the additional information appearing at the top of the screen that describes the selected icon (item 15 in Fig.2 of the Douglas reference). Thus, Douglas does not

Appl. No. 09/683,650
Amtd. dated June 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2005

teach or suggest selecting a plurality of icons and displaying the selected icons such that the user is capable of recognizing the plurality of selected icons, and Douglas does not anticipate the currently amended claims 1, 13, and 23. Claims 9, 11, 22, and 31-32 have been cancelled, and are no longer in need of consideration. Claims 3-8, 10,
5 15-21, and 25-30 are dependent on claims 1, 13, and 23, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3-8, 10, 13, 15-21, 23, and 25-30 is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claims 2, 14, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

10 Claims 2, 14, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas in view of Bazerman et al. (US 6,850,253) for reasons of record.

Response:

15 Claims 2, 14, and 24 are dependent on claims 1, 13, and 23, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2, 14, and 24 is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

20 Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas in view of Pollock for reasons of record.

Response:

25 Douglas teaches selecting a single icon, as explained above. Pollock teaches creating an email address link. Neither Douglas nor Pollock teach sending e-mail to e-mail addresses of a plurality of selected icons. Instead, combining the teachings of Douglas and Pollock would only teach one skilled in the art to send an e-mail to a single person corresponding to the single selected icon. Therefore, claim 12 is patentable over the combination of Douglas and Pollock. Reconsideration of claim 12

Appl. No. 09/683,650
Amtd. dated June 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2005

is respectfully requested.

In view of the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

5

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 21, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

10 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

15 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.